



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Glossar zu Farman's Anteil an der Rushworth-Glosse (Rushworth I). Von Ernst Schulte. Bonn. Carl Georgi, 1904. Pp. 98.

As English scholarship at present needs lexicons and concordances at least as much as anything else, we were prepared to welcome this glossary, which, taken in conjunction with Lindelöf's on Rushworth² (see JOURNAL 1. 264) covers the whole of the Rushworth gloss, as contained in Skeat's edition—that is the whole of Matthew, Mark 1–2. 15, and John 18. 1–3.

An examination of the words on p. 149 of Skeat's edition (Matt. 18. 15–22), a page taken at random, discloses the following errors and omissions in the glossary: Under *æft*: *eft*, 18. 19, should be *eft soþ*.—Under *ænig*: *ds.* should be *dns.*—Under *broþer*: I do not see why *broþer*, 18. 15, should be queried, especially as *ðin*, in agreement with it, is not.—Under *eorþe*: 18. 18, 19, is wrong as designating *eorðan*; the two verses contain *eorðe*, *eordan*, and *eorþan*, all in the dative, the second of these being entered by our author in its proper place.—Under *from*: *Browne* should be *Brown*.—Under *gangan*: there is no means of determining what forms have a particular Latin meaning, though the Preface declares that provision is made for this in all cases.—Under *geheran*: 18. 17⁽²⁾ does not designate a plural *geherað* after *æghwile þara þe*, as the statement seems to be; moreover, there is no reason to doubt that the form is a plural, since the subject, *he*, is unquestioningly classed as a plural on p. 49.—Under *gesomnigan*: *gesomnade*, 18. 20, called a plur. pret., is rather more likely to be an inflected past part.: cf. 22. 41; 25. 32; 26. 3.—Under *heofun*: 18. 19 does not contain *heofunum*, but *hefonum*.—Under *hundseofuntig*: *septies septuagies* should evidently be *septuagies*, and the head-word should be *hundseofuntig(um)* *sipum*.—Under *oþ*: *oþ*, 18. 22, does not translate *usque in*, but *usque*, and the same is true of *oþþe*, 18. 21.—Under *siofun sipum*: *sipum*, 18. 21, should be *sipum*.—Under *siþ*: *hundseofuntig(um)* *sipum* is omitted.—Under *þreo*: 18. 16 has a gen., not a nom. or acc. Considering the comparative simplicity and brevity of the text, these errors are manifestly too numerous, especially as the author says in the Preface (p. 4): 'Mein erstes Prinzip bei dieser Arbeit war, das im Text Stehende getreu bis ins Kleinste wiederzugeben.'

The device for indicating the Latin equivalent for each several occurrence of the English word is ingenious, and deserves the attention of future compilers of glossaries.

It is to be regretted, as in the case of Lindelöf's work, that a Latin-Old English index has not been appended.

In general, the glossary is capable of rendering good service, but cannot be absolutely depended upon, as the list of errors above will show.

ALBERT S. COOK.

The German Influence on Samuel Taylor Coleridge. An Abridgment of a Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Department of Philosophy of the University of Pennsylvania. By John Louis Haney. Philadelphia, 1902. Pp. 44.

Although narrower in scope than its title might imply, this monograph challenges attention and merits respect from every student of Coleridge. Dr. Haney's investigation, as his first sentence hints, comes under the head of comparative studies in literature.¹ By assuming the position rather of a biographer of Coleridge in a special field, the author wisely limits a research that could easily outrun the aim of a doctoral dissertation. He avoids examining the more fugitive phenomena of literary and philosophical movements, with their various indirect influences—such, for example, as Goethe must have exerted through various media upon Coleridge. Dr. Haney lays decidedly more emphasis upon matters like the direct conscious and personal undervaluation which Coleridge often showed for Goethe in passages that can be cited; he selects for the material of a scientific investigation what is concrete and tangible. In his unabridged thesis 'an attempt was made to show the real character of the influence of German literature upon Coleridge by discussing (1) Coleridge's own utterances concerning German authors and their writings; (2) the evident literary influences, whether acknowledged or not; (3) the probable or possible

¹ May we hope that Mr. Gayley's masterly article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for July, 1903, has dealt a death-blow, at least in professional circles, to expressions like 'the study of comparative literature'?